



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,725	02/06/2002	Kaoru Murase	2002_0184A	4067

513 7590 12/08/2006

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
2033 K STREET N. W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021

EXAMINER

HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/066,725

Applicant(s)

MURASE ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew T. Henning

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-26,28-36 and 38-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-26,28-36 and 38-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/13/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1 This action is in response to the communication filed on 9/18/2006.

2 **DETAILED ACTION**

3 ***Response to Arguments***

4 Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art rejections of claims 1-2, 4-26, 28-36,
5 and 38-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6 Regarding applicant's argument that the specification has provided support for claim 19,
7 the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. Again, the specification does not provide
8 support for judging whether there is enough processing capacity to destroy just the parts of the
9 data block. Instead, the specification provides support for judging whether there is enough
10 processing capacity to destroy **both** all of the parts of the data block **and** the encryption key.
11 Furthermore, a mere allegation that the foreign priority document supports such language is not
12 found persuasive without a certified translation of the document and without pointing to the
13 specific location of the support in the document. As such, the examiner has maintained the
14 objection to the specification and the rejection of claims 19-21 under 35 USC 112 1st Paragraph.

15 Regarding the IDS submitted 5/13/2004, DE 4433868 A1 has been considered.

16 Claims 1-2, 4-26, 28-36, and 38-44 have been examined, while claims 3, 27, and 37 have
17 been cancelled.

18 All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

19 ***Specification***

20 The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the
21 claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the
22 following is required: The claim 19 recites that only a part of the data block is destroyed if the

Art Unit: 2131

1 nullification device “does not have a processing capacity sufficient to destroy all parts of the data
2 block”. See the rejection of claims 19-21 under 35 USC 112 1st Paragraph below.

3 The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

4 The amendment filed 9/18/2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it
5 introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall
6 introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not
7 supported by the original disclosure is as follows: The original specification did not provide
8 support for a “judging unit which judges whether ... to destroy all parts of the data block which
9 includes data relating to the digital content and is judged as needing to be nullified”. Instead, the
10 original specification provided support for a “judging unit which judges whether ... to destroy all
11 parts of the pair of encrypted data block and encrypted decryption key which is judged as
12 needing to be nullified”.

13 Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

14
15 ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

16 The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

17 The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
18 and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
19 pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
20 contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
21
22

23 Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with
24 the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not
25 described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant

Art Unit: 2131

1 art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed
2 invention. The claim 19 recites that only a part of the data block is destroyed if the nullification
3 device “does not have a processing capacity sufficient to destroy all parts of the data block”.
4 However, support is only provided in the specification for judging if the nullification device “has
5 enough processing capacity to destroy **all parts of the pair** of encrypted data block **and**
6 encrypted decryption key which is judged as needing to be nullified” (See Specification
7 paragraph 0181). Therefore, it would not be clear to the ordinary person skilled in the art as to
8 whether the applicants had possession of the claimed invention at the time of invention.
9 Therefore, claims 19-21 are rejected for failing to meet the written description requirement of 35
10 USC 112 1st Paragraph.

11 ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

12 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

13 Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
14 any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
15 requirements of this title.

16
17 Claims 1-2, and 4-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is
18 directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although the claims are directed towards a “device”
19 comprising a combination of “units” the examiner points to the specification Page 18 Paragraph
20 3 wherein it is shown that the steps performed by the “units” can be performed by software. As
21 such, a reasonable interpretation of the claim language includes the case where each unit is
22 simply a set of computer program instructions. As such, the claims are directed towards a
23 program listing, which is non functional descriptive material *per se*, which does not fall within
24 one of the statutory categories of invention. Therefore, claims 1-2 and 4-24 are rejected for
25 failing to meet the statutory subject matter requirement of 35 USC 101. See MPEP § 2106.01.

Art Unit: 2131

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 12-14, 31, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sharp (DE4433868A1), for the reasons provided for in the European Search Report EP02003372 Dated April 7, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 12-18, 25-28, 31-33, 35-36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushita (US Patent Number 6,694,002) hereinafter referred to as Matsushita, and further in view of Thompson et al. (US Patent Number 6,341,342) hereinafter referred to as Thompson.

The applied references have a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention “by another”; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in

Art Unit: 2131

1 the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in
2 accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the
3 reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.
4 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

5 Regarding claim 1, Matsushita disclosed a data nullification device for nullifying at least
6 a part of target data recorded on a recording medium, the target data being made up a plurality of
7 data blocks (See Matsushita Abstract and Figs. 1 and 4), the data nullification device comprising:
8 a judging unit (See Matsushita Figs. 1 Element 18) operable to judge, for each data block of the
9 target data, whether the data block needs be nullified (See Matsushita Fig. 4 Step S3a and Col. 6
10 Lines 31-57); a receiving unit operable to receive continuously transmitted data from an external
11 device, and set received data as a new data block (See Matsushita Col. 5 Line 45 – Col. 6 Line
12 12); and a nullifying unit (See Matsushita Fig. 1 Element 21) operable to, when a predetermined
13 number of data blocks are judged as needing to be nullified or when one or more data blocks
14 whose total amount of data reaches a predetermined amount are judged as needing to be
15 nullified, nullify the judged data blocks (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 41-54), but failed to
16 specifically disclose the new data overwriting the previously judged data. However, Matsushita
17 did disclose that the new data blocks were recorded to the same medium as the judged data
18 blocks (See Matsushita Col. 5 Line 45 – Col. 6 Line 57 “hard disk”), and disclosed “zeroing” the
19 previously judged data (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 51-54).

20 Thompson teaches that in a recording system, instead of zeroing data, the data can be
21 overwritten with new data (See Thompson Col. 10 Paragraph 1).

Art Unit: 2131

1 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
2 invention to employ the teachings of Thompson in the recording system of Matsushita by writing
3 new data onto the entire data of the packet pointed by the simultaneous erasing pointer EP
4 instead of writing '0'. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the
5 art would have been motivated to eliminate the overhead of zeroing the data of the packet.

6
7 Regarding claim 25, Matsushita disclosed A data nullification program embodied on a computer
8 readable medium for nullifying at least a part of target data recorded on a recording medium, the
9 target data being made up of a plurality of data blocks, the data nullification program causing a
10 computer to execute of a method comprising: judging, for each data block of the target data,
11 whether the data block needs to be nullified (See Matsushita Fig. 4 Step S3a and Col. 6 Lines 31-
12 57); receiving continuously transmitted data from an external device, and setting the received
13 data as a new data block (See Matsushita Col. 5 Line 45 – Col. 6 Line 12); and overwriting,
14 when predetermined number of data blocks are judged as needing to be nullified or when one or
15 more data blocks whose total amount of data reaches a predetermined amount are judged as
16 needing to be nullified, the judged data blocks (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 41-54) but failed to
17 specifically disclose the new data overwriting the previously judged data. However, Matsushita
18 did disclose that the new data blocks were recorded to the same medium as the judged data
19 blocks (See Matsushita Col. 5 Line 45 – Col. 6 Line 57 “hard disk”), and disclosed “zeroing” the
20 previously judged data (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 51-54).

21 Thompson teaches that in a recording system, instead of zeroing data, the data can be
22 overwritten with new data (See Thompson Col. 10 Paragraph 1).

Art Unit: 2131

1 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
2 invention to employ the teachings of Thompson in the recording system of Matsushita by writing
3 new data onto the entire data of the packet pointed by the simultaneous erasing pointer EP
4 instead of writing '0'. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the
5 art would have been motivated to eliminate the overhead of zeroing the data of the packet.

6 Matsushita further failed to disclose method being implemented in software. However, it
7 was well know that the functionality of a system can be implemented in software in order to
8 provide for greater ease of upgrade. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary
9 person skilled in the art at the time of invention to implement the system of Matsushita in
10 software running on a processor. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person
11 skilled in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to ensure the system could
12 be easily upgraded.

13 Regarding claim 35, Matsushita disclosed a data nullification method for nullifying at
14 least a part of target data recorded on a recording medium, the target data being made up of a
15 plurality of data blocks, the data nullification method comprising: judging, for each data block of
16 the target data, whether the data block needs to be nullified (See Matsushita Fig. 4 Step S3a and
17 Col. 6 Lines 31-57); receiving continuously transmitted data from an external device, and setting
18 the received data as a new data block (See Matsushita Col. 5 Line 45 – Col. 6 Line 12); and
19 overwriting, when predetermined number of data blocks are judged as needing to be nullified or
20 when one or more data blocks whose total amount of data reaches a predetermined amount are
21 judged as needing to be nullified, the judged data blocks (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 41-54) but
22 failed to specifically disclose the new data overwriting the previously judged data. However,

Art Unit: 2131

1 Matsushita did disclose that the new data blocks were recorded to the same medium as the
2 judged data blocks (See Matsushita Col. 5 Line 45 – Col. 6 Line 57 “hard disk”), and disclosed
3 “zeroing” the previously judged data (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 51-54).

4 Thompson teaches that in a recording system, instead of zeroing data, the data can be
5 overwritten with new data (See Thompson Col. 10 Paragraph 1).

6 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
7 invention to employ the teachings of Thompson in the recording system of Matsushita by writing
8 new data onto the entire data of the packet pointed by the simultaneous erasing pointer EP
9 instead of writing ‘0’. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the
10 art would have been motivated to eliminate the overhead of zeroing the data of the packet.

11 Regarding claims 2, 26, and 36, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed that the recording
12 medium stores sequence information that shows a sequence in which the plurality of data blocks
13 were recorded onto the recording medium and the judging unit judges, in succession, the
14 plurality of data blocks in the sequence shown by the sequence information, as needing to be
15 nullified (See Matsushita Figs. 1 and 4, and Col. 6 Lines 29-57).

16 Regarding claim 4, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed that each data block has a length
17 corresponding fixed transmission time period, a specified number of recording areas which are
18 each used as a recording area of a data block are reserved on the recording medium (See
19 Matsushita Col. 5 Line 66 – Col. 6 Line 6).

20 Regarding claim 5, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed that if the length corresponding
21 to the fixed transmission time period is variable and if part of the recorded data block remains

Art Unit: 2131

1 even after the new data block is written, the nullifying unit further writes arbitrary data over the
2 part of the recorded data block (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 51-54).

3 Regarding claim 6, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed that if there is not a new data
4 block which is to be recorded, the nullifying unit writes arbitrary data to the recording area (See
5 Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 51-54).

6 Regarding claims 7, 12, 28, 31, 38, and 41, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed a
7 utilizing unit operable to utilize the target data recorded on the recording medium, wherein the
8 judging unit data block which was utilized by in units of data blocks, further judges that each the
9 utilizing unit needs nullified (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 29-57).

10 Regarding claim 8, and 13 Matsushita and Thompson disclosed that the target data is
11 content data which is transmitted from an external device and recorded on the recording medium
12 (See Matsushita Col. 5 Lines 45-65 and Abstract), the content data is accompanied with copy
13 control information showing whether copying of the content data is permitted or prohibited (See
14 Matsushita Col. 5 Lines 51-53), the utilizing unit reproduces the content data recorded on the
15 recording medium, in units of data blocks, and only if the copy control information
16 accompanying the content data shows that the copying of the content data is prohibited, the
17 judging unit judges that each data block which was reproduced by the utilizing unit needs to be
18 nullified (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 31-54).

19 Regarding claim 14, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed that the target data is
20 accompanied with copy control information showing whether copying of the target data
21 permitted or prohibited (See Matsushita Col. 5 Lines 51-53), the utilizing unit records the on the
22 recording medium, to another target data recorded recording medium, units of data blocks, and

Art Unit: 2131

1 only if the copy control information accompanying the target data shows that the copying of the
2 target data is prohibited, the judging unit judges that each data block on the recording medium
3 which was recorded by the utilizing unit needs to be nullified (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 31-54
4 and Col. 6 Line 66 – Col. 7 Line 11).

5 Regarding claims 15, 32, and 42, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed that the nullifying
6 unit destroys all parts of a data block which is judged as needing to be nullified (See Matsushita
7 Col. 6 Lines 51-54).

8 Regarding claims 16, 33, and 43, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed that the nullifying
9 unit destroys at least a part of a data block which is judged as needing to be nullified, the part of
10 the data block being necessary to utilize remaining parts of the data block (See Matsushita Col. 6
11 Lines 51-54).

12 Regarding claim 17, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed that the target data is MPEG
13 data including I pictures, and the part of the data block necessary to utilize the remaining parts
14 the data block an I picture (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 51-54 and Col. 6 Line 67 – Col. 7 Line
15 2).

16 Regarding claim 18, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed that the target data is MPEG
17 data including I pictures, and the part of the data block necessary to utilize the remaining parts of
18 the data block a first sector of an I picture (See Matsushita Col. 6 Lines 51-54 and Col. 6 Line 67
19 – Col. 7 Line 2).

20

Art Unit: 2131

1 Claims 9-11, 29-30, and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
2 over Matsushita and Thompson as applied to claims 1, 25, and 35 above, and further in view of
3 Garfinkle (US Patent Number 5,400,402).

4 Regarding claims 9, 29, and 39, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed judging whether
5 data blocks needed to be nullified or not and whenever any data block is judged as needing to be
6 nullified, the nullifying unit nullifies the data block irrespective of whether the predetermined
7 number of data blocks are judged as needing to be nullified or whether one or more data blocks
8 whose total amount of data reaches the predetermined amount are judged as needing to be
9 nullified (See Matsushita Col. 51-54), but failed to disclose the data blocks having an expiration
10 time at which they would need to be nullified.

11 Garfinkle teaches that downloaded content should be given a time limit and once the time
12 limit is reached the content should be erased (See Garfinkle Col. 2 Lines 26-35).

13 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
14 invention to employ the teachings of Garfinkle in the content system of Matsushita and
15 Thompson by providing a time limit with the content packets and erasing the content packets
16 once the time limit was over. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled
17 in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to control the use of the received
18 content.

19 Regarding claims 10, 30, and 40, see the rejection of claim 7 above.

20 Regarding claim 11, see the rejection of claim 8 above.

21

Art Unit: 2131

1 Claims 19-24, 34, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
2 Matsushita and Thompson as applied to claims 1, 16, 25, and 35 above, and further in view of
3 Masinter (US Patent Number 5,742,807).

4 Regarding claims 22, 34, and 44, Matsushita and Thompson disclosed that each data
5 block recorded on the recording medium has been encrypted using an individual encryption key
6 (See Matsushita Col. 5 Lines 57-62), and a decryption key for decrypting the encrypted data
7 block is stored on the recording medium (See Matsushita Col. 5 Lines 57-62 and Col. 6 Lines
8 41-45), but failed to disclose destroying the key when the data block is judged to be erased.

9 Masinter teaches that data which is encrypted can be destroyed simply by destroying the
10 decryption key for the data (See Masinter Col. 2 Lines 57-61) and that the key used to encrypt
11 and decrypt the data can be a hash of the data (See Masinter Col. 2 Lines 54-56)

12 It would have been obvious to employ the teachings of Masinter in the content erasing
13 system of Matsushita and Thompson by only destroying the decryption key for each packet
14 judged to be erased. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art
15 would have been motivated to decrease the amount of overwriting required to erase each packet.

16 Regarding claim 23, the combination of Matsushita, Thompson, and Masinter disclosed
17 an acquiring unit operable to acquire the target data in an encoded form (See Matsushita Col. 6
18 Lines 41-45); a decoding unit operable to decode the encoded target data using a user key which
19 has been provided to authorized users in advance, to obtain the target data (See Matsushita Col. 6
20 Lines 41-45); a key generating unit operable to generate an arbitrary encryption key and a
21 decryption key corresponding to the encryption key, for each data block of the target data (See
22 Masinter Col. 5 Lines 40-48); a data encrypting unit operable to encrypt the data block using the

Art Unit: 2131

1 encryption key so that the encrypted data block can be decrypted using the corresponding
2 decryption key (See Masinter Col. 2 Lines 54-56); a key encrypting unit operable to encrypt the
3 decryption key using an identifier unique to the data nullification device (See Masinter Col. 4
4 Paragraph 2); and recording unit operable to record the encrypted data block and the encrypted
5 decryption key onto recording medium (See Matsushita Col. 5 Lines 45-65).

6 Regarding claim 24, the combination of Matsushita, Thompson, and Masinter disclosed
7 that at least the decoding unit, the key generating unit, the data encrypting unit, and the key
8 encrypting unit are contained in a single semiconductor chip (See Matsushita Fig. 1).

9 Regarding claims 19-21, the combination of Matsushita, Thompson, and Masinter
10 disclosed that when the data nullification device does not have a processing capacity sufficient to
11 destroy all parts of the data block, the nullifying unit destroys only the part of the data block
12 necessary to utilize the remaining parts of the data block (See the rejection of claim 22 above), a
13 destroying unit operable to destroy remaining parts of data blocks which were not destroyed by
14 the nullifying unit, when the data nullification device has a processing capacity sufficient to
15 destroy remaining parts of data blocks which were not destroyed by said nullifying unit (See
16 Matsushita Col. 5 Line 45 – Col. 6 Line 11).

17 *Conclusion*


18 Claims 1-2, 4-26, 28-36, and 38-44 have been rejected.

19 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
20 examiner should be directed to Matthew T. Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790.
21 The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

Art Unit: 2131

1 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
2 supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the
3 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

4 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
5 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
6 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
7 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
8 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
9 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

10
11
12 
13 Matthew Henning
14 Assistant Examiner
15 Art Unit 2131
16 3/13/2006


17
AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100